IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD

(Special Original Jurisdiction)

WEDNESDAY, THE FIRST DAY OF DECEMBER
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR

PRESENT

THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE L.NARASIMHA REDDY

-

WRIT PETITION NO : 22025 of 2004

Between:

Smt. Shankaramma, W/o Late Sailoo,
R/o Kakarlapahad, Nawabpet Mandal, Mahabubnagar District.

.... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Superintending Engineer, (Operations) APSEB (AP

GENCO), Mahabubnagar.
2 The Divisional Engineer,(Operations) APSEB (AP

GENCO), Mahabubnagar.

....RESPONDENTS

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to issue an appropriate writ, order or direction, more particularly a Writ in the nature of Mandamus, declaring the action of the respondents in not disposing of the representation dated 16-11-2004 made by the petitioner seeking to consider the case of her eldest son for appointment on compassionate grounds as a special case as being illegal, violative of Article 21 of the Constitution of India and consequently direct the respondents to dispose off the said representation expeditiously, and pass such other order and further order or orders as are deemed fit and proper.

Counsel for the Petitioner: MR.M.A.ASHFAQ MOHIUDDIN

Counsel for the Respondents: MR.S.RAVINDRANATH

The Court at the admission stage made the following:

-

-

ORDER: -

The petitioner claims to have submitted a representation, dated 16.11.2004, to the respondents with a request to provide appointment on compassionate grounds, to her son. Her husband, who was employed as helper with the respondents, is said to have died on 17.05.1991, while in service. She seeks appropriate directions in this regard to the respondents for disposal of her representation.

2. Heard learned counsel for the petitioner and learned counsel for the respondents.

3. The husband of the petitioner died, way back, on 17.05.1991. It is not known whether the present claim of the petitioner falls within the scheme framed by the respondents for providing compassionate appointment. It is for the respondents to examine the case of the petitioner and pass appropriate orders. The representation is said to have been made on 16.11.2004. Hence, it cannot be said that there was undue delay on the part of the respondents.

4. Be that as it may, the writ petition is disposed of directing the first respondent to consider the representation of the petitioner, dated 16.11.2004, and pass appropriate orders thereon, within two months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order. There shall be no order as to costs.

_____

L.NARASIMHA REDDY, J

Dated: 01st December, 2004

RAR

To

1 The Superintending Engineer, (Operations) APSEB (AP

GENCO), Mahabubnagar.
2 The Divisional Engineer,(Operations) APSEB (AP

GENCO), Mahabubnagar.

3 2 CD copies.